



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,208	09/10/2003	Won-Kyung Seong	45702	3224
7590		12/18/2007		
Peter L. Kendall				
Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.				
Suite 600				
1300 19th Street, N.W.				
Washington, DE 20036				
			EXAMINER	
			LEE, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/658,208

Applicant(s)

SEONG, WON-KYUNG

Examiner

M. Lee

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/07</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, and 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pack et al. (2002/0010923).

Regarding claim 1, Pack discloses a digital broadcast receiver showing an input means (user input), a control means (21), a tuner (10), a decoder (11), a video processing means (13, 14, 15, 18-20), and a display means (Figure 7). The television signal is displayed on a mobile terminal (0044, 0045).

Regarding claim 2, the video memory 14 meets the second and third memories because it is capable to store more than one frame of video data, and the information memory 19 meets the first memory as claimed.

Regarding claim 3, see paragraph 0047.

Regarding claim 5, see paragraph 0065.

Regarding claim 6, see paragraph 0060.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4, and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pack et al. (2002/0010923).

Regarding claim 4, Pack does not specify the format scalar as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that using format scalar to convert video image from one size to another is well known in the art because it enables different image sizes to be displayed on different monitors with variety of sizes. Without it, the images display on a screen can only be partially displayed or not completely fill up the whole screen, which can be very annoying. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a format scalar into Pack so that the video signals from the output of the decoder could be displayed on different monitors.

Regarding claims 7 and 8, Pack shows a scale up feature (0057) but not the rotating feature as claimed. The examiner takes Official Notice that rotating an image operation is well known in the art because it enables an image to be rotated in different orientations so that it can be viewed comfortably. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an image rotating means into Pack so that the image could be viewed in different angles.

Regarding claims 9 and 10, in addition of above, Pack does not specify the analog/digital converter as claimed. Instead, Pack operates in digital domain only. In any event, the examiner takes Official Notice that using analog technique to transmit television signal is well known in the art because it is simple and economical to implement. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pack to operate in the analog domain so that the cost of product could be lowered.

Regarding claim 11, Pack inherently includes inter integrated circuit bus interface because circuit blocks in Figure 4 interconnected with each other through some bus means.

Regarding claims 12-18, in addition of above, Pack does not specify that the video data and user data is stored in a memory. Instead, they stored in two separate memories (14, 19). In any event, the examiner takes Official Notice that using a single large memory to store different information by dividing the memory into different segments is well known in the art because it reduces the size and power consumption of a device as opposed to store information in separate memories. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to combine the memories 14 and 19 together so that the size and power consumption could be reduced. In addition, the television signal in Pack is intended to be transmitted in wireless networks such as a mobile cellular telecommunications network (0045).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Lee whose telephone number 571-272-7349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David L. Ometz, can be reached on 571-272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



M. Lee
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622